REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated August 18, 2008.

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

I.   SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the examiner claims that the specification does not disclose the processors associated with the computer system claims 1 and 17 and correction is required.

Applicant respectfully points out that examiner is mistaken in asserting that the specification does not disclose a processor associated with the computer systems claims 1 and 17. The claims are considered part of the specifications. The specifications throughout and the claims, clearly describe an interactive system incorporating "a computer system". A "computer system" by definition, inherently requires a processor, memory and execution of instructions (program), which are the necessary components for a "computer system" to function. A processor is inherent of a computer and is what executes program instructions. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines a computer as "a programmable, usually electronic device that can store, retrieve, and process data."[1] According to Webopedia, the online encyclopedia for computer technology, a computer system is defined as "A complete, working computer. The computer system includes not only the computer, but also any software and peripheral devices that are necessary to make the computer function. Every

---

[1] *See* "Merriam-Webster OnLine Dictionary", http//www.Merriam-webster.com/dictionary/computer.

computer system, for example, requires an operating system."[2] As is well known to those skilled in the art, and by its plain meaning, a "computer system" cannot effectively function without one or more processors and therefore such processors are inherently supported by the specification.

However, in the interests of moving along prosecution of the application and if correction is still required to overcome the objection, Applicant submits the amendment to the specification, without admitting the lack of antecedence of the term "processors". Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment to the specification and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

II. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In the Action, Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

Claims 1 and 17 were objected to for the phrase "one of the 'FIND' conditions" as rendering the claim indefinite.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, (hereinafter "Section 101") as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (hereinafter "Section 103(a)") as being allegedly unpatentable over Petersen et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,308,179, hereinafter "Petersen") in view of Sheppard (U.S. Pat. 5,832,472, hereinafter "Sheppard") and further in view of Pinkham (U.S. Pat. Publication 20040243390).

---

[2] *See* "Webopedia.com", http//www.webopedia.com/TERM/computer_system.html.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration for all

pending claims in light of the remarks below.

III.   CLAIM OBJECTION

Applicant amends claims 1 and 17 to clarify the term "one of the 'FIND' conditions"

to now more clearly state and provide antecedent basis for "'FIND' conditions". Applicant

thereby amends claims 1 and 17 with "one of a plurality of 'FIND' conditions". Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 17.

IV.   SECTION 101 REJECTION

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory

subject matter. In particular, the Action states that the claims lack the necessary physical

articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within in the meaning of 35 USC

101. The Action further states that the claims fail to fall within a statutory category and are at

best, functional descriptive material per se.

The claims recite an "interactive system" using a "computer system". The claims, the

specification and the figures as originally submitted, describe a "computer system," which

inherently provides for the necessary structural components for a computer system to

function, including a processor. Examiner is directed to the claims as they have been

previously amended and as they are currently presented, clearly claiming the physical

components of the system claimed and in no manner describes "software per se". The

claims recite "said interactive system comprising...one or more processors for executing

commands that direct operation of the computer system and memory operatively coupled to

the one or more processors". The inherent physical components of the "computer system"

are in the claim to clarify and leave no question that the claims refer to statutory subject

matter. Adequate support for these structural components are found throughout the

specification and in the claim themselves, in which a "computer system" is inherently defined

to include such components. As mentioned, the specification has been further amended to

provide the definition of a computer system. As the claims have been amended, there can be

no other interpretation, than a system as a physical object. The original claims further support

the statutory subject matter by not only reciting "modules" but the apparent physical objects

of the user interface, databases, control system and their functional interrelationship.

Accordingly, the claims as presented clearly provide for statutory subject matter. By the plain

meaning and intent of the specifications, figures and claims, a system as a physical object is

being claimed. It is believed that the claims clearly state the components and necessary

functional and structural interrelationship of the interactive system, to satisfy the requirements

of Section 101.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to contain all the essential elements necessary to be

directed to statutory subject matter. Independent claim 17 also enumerates all the essential

elements included in claim 1 and for at least the same reasons as mentioned above for claim 1,

it is directed to statutory subject matter. Dependent claims 2-16 and 19 depend directly or

indirectly on amended claim 1, and therefore are also directed to statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under Section 101.

V.   SECTION 103(a) REJECTIONS

This Action rejects Claim 1 under Section 103(a) in view of Petersen, Sheppard, and

Pinkham.

A prima facie case of obviousness is not established as none of the cited references alone or in combination teach or suggest ALL the claim limitations of amended claim 1 for at least the reasons as discussed below.

According to the Examiner, col. 11, lines 21-22 teach of "a user database". However, claim 1 recites the required limitations of "a user database *comprising a history of past user interaction with the system*". The recited claim limitation is not taught by the cited language and is therefore distinguished from Petersen. Petersen, lines 21-22 of col. 11 states, "Principles 1-n each have their own kernel for managing documents." Petersen goes on to discuss "Documents are considered to be documents the corresponding principal 1-n has brought into its document management space. Particularly, they are documents that a principal *considers to be of value* and therefore has in some manner marked as a document of the principal." (col. 11, lines 22-27, emphasis added). No where in Petersen is there disclosed a "user database comprising a history of past user interaction with the system." The language of Petersen supports documents being added to a document management space that are "considered to be of value". Such teaching of random documents which may be considered or may not be considered to be of value, in no manner shows a "user database comprising a history of past user interaction with the system".

The Examiner states that Col. 11, lines 64-67 of Petersen disclose "at least one classified bank module to input, organize, and manage one's own documents in the form of data/records in the databases". Rather, lines 64-67 of col. 11 of Petersen generally state, "The above described architecture allows for sharing and transmission of documents between principals and provides the flexibility needed for organizing documents." Applicant

respectfully does not see where the vague language of Petersen specifically teaches a "classified bank module to input, organize, and manage one's own documents". Similarly, lines 64-67 of col. 11 of Petersen also fail to teach of "a plurality of modules each comprising code operable when executed with a processor for sharing, invoking, and/or customizing encyclopedia data/record(s) in a databank for improvement of one's knowledge on various subjects", by the same general language which does not refer to any modules as claimed. Accordingly, not all the required limitations of amended claim 1 are taught by the cited reference.

Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite in part that the "control system...display[s] relevant data/record(s)... on a user selecting from presented options including one of a plurality of 'FIND' conditions, more than one of the 'FIND conditions, and none of the 'FIND conditions...". In contrast, Petersen, in col. 21, lines 30-38 does not teach the required limitations as recited in claim 1. Rather, Petersen describes a general "find() method by "giving a search term" in relation to "setting a property" of a document. Fig. 9 and col. 26, lines 57-67 further only show a single "dialog box". However, as claimed, the user "select[s] from presented options", and these options *include* "one", "more than one", and "none" of the plurality of 'FIND' conditions" . Such specifically claimed numerous "presented options" are not taught in Petersen by a singular dialog box, i.e. a general find condition. Accordingly, Petersen fails to teach the claimed limitations of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites that the "control system... maintain[s] a history of *records viewed by a user* during interaction with a module." (emphasis added). Petersen has been identified on page 7 of the Action as failing to provide for this required element of amended claim 1. Examiner cites to Sheppard as providing the support for "a history of past

user interaction with the system". Applicant respectfully clarifies, that claim 1 recites maintaining "a history of **records viewed by a user** during interaction with a module". Sheppard, in col. 11. lines 26-30 teaches of accessing a "stored profile and a user 'trial number'" which is "the number of times that a particular user has performed a search". As required in claim 1, maintaining "a history of records viewed by a user during interaction with a module" is not the same as a "number" which reflects how many time a search was performed. The history of the actual records that were "viewed" is being claimed which is not the equivalent to the numerical number of how many searches were conducted, there is simply no teaching of "history of records viewed by a user" as required in claim 1. As such, Sheppard fails to teach the required limitation of claim 1.

Accordingly, with regard to all remaining required limitations as discussed above in view of Petersen, neither Sheppard nor Pinkham, alone or in combination, provide for the deficiencies of Petersen.

Petersen, Sheppard and Pinkham, by themselves or in conjunction, fail to teach all limitations of claim 1. The specific language of the claims have been identified above and shown to be distinguished from the references. Thus, there is no showing of a prima facie case of obviousness, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under Section 103(a), and submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 17 has been amended and includes similar limitations as in claim 1. Accordingly, for at least all the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1, claim 17 is also believed allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 under Section 103(a).

Dependent claims 2-16 and 19 depend directly or indirectly on claim 1, with additional limitations, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as is claim 1. In addition, claim 18 depends directly on claim 17, with additional limitations, and is allowable for at least the same reasons as is claim 17.

Accordingly, for the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-19 under Section 103(a), and submits by the present amendment, that these claims are allowable over Petersen, Sheppard and Pinkham.

VI. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the pending claims and the remarks presented herein successfully traverse the rejections of the claims. Allowance of Claims 1-19 is therefore requested. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the above remarks, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: __11/18/2008_____   _____/Juneko Jackson/_____
                             Otto O. Lee   (Reg. No.: 37,871)
                             Juneko Jackson   (Reg. No.: 48,870)
                             Intellectual Property Law Group LLP
                             Attorneys for Applicant

Atty Docket No.: KRISHNA.GORADIA.PT6
Contact No.: 408-286-8933